E. L. Coley

OCTOBER 1959

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

DULLES: HIS SOUL GOES MARCHING ON

THE EDITORS

MARXISM AND PSYCHOANALYSIS

PAUL A. BARAN

Socialist Gallups: Opinion Surveys Behind the Iron Curtain EVE MERRIAM

VOL. 11

6

EDITORS . . . LEO HUBERMAN . . . PAUL M. SWEEZY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS

VOLUME ELEVEN NUMBER SIX OCTOBER 1959

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: His Soul Goes Marching On 177
MARXISM AND PSYCHOANALYSIS by Paul A. Baran 186
NO SILVER PLATTER by Vincent Hallinan 201
SOCIALIST GALLUPS: OPINION SURVEYS BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN by Eve Merriam 205
LIGHT ON AFRICA by Keith M. Buchanan 212
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 218

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright, ©1959, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 218 West 10th Street, New York 14, New York. Telephone: ORegon 5-6939.

MAILING ADDRESS: 66 Barrow Street, New York 14, New York. Address ALL communications to 66 Barrow Street.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$4; two years—$7. By 1st class mail—United States $6; everywhere else $7. By air mail—No. America $8; So. America $13; Europe $17; Asia $24.

EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

Marx's theory of alienation is much talked about these days, but how many people really understand what it is or what it implies? If our observations are at all accurate, the answer is very few. That is the reason we welcomed the chance to publish Fritz Pappenheim's *The Alienation of Modern Man*, now set for publication on December 8th. Dr. Pappenheim's book is clear, straightforward, reliable, and free of all fancification. Its main mission, like that of MR and MR Press generally, is to help *educate* its readers. We believe that it is admirably suited to that purpose, and we strongly recommend that you buy it and urge others to buy it at the prepublication price of $2.50. It should be ready for delivery about the middle of November. After December 8 the price goes up to $4.

(*continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HIS SOUL GOES MARCHING ON

We write before Soviet Premier Khrushchev's arrival in the United States and without any intention to try to guess what kind of reception he is likely to receive or to assess the probable impact on public opinion in this country or abroad. We are rather concerned to put the whole affair and the situation out of which it arose in historical perspective. Only in this way, it seems to us, can one avoid being continuously confused and deceived by the ebb and flow of political moods and popular fancies.

It has been said many times in the last few weeks that when Eisenhower decided to invite Khrushchev to visit the United States he broke with the policies of John Foster Dulles and launched the nation on a new course in international affairs. How far and in what sense is this really true? This is the key question to which we must address ourselves.

Dulles's policies, as we have repeatedly emphasized in these pages, were all directed to one end, rolling back Communism at least to its pre-World War II frontiers and thus establishing *de facto* American world hegemony. In the broadest sense, his method was to build up a grand capitalist military alliance, apply constantly increasing pressure of all kinds to the socialist bloc, and wait for what he regarded as the inevitable collapse of a supposedly inherently unworkable system. Dulles not only proclaimed these policies in words; he also implemented them in action in every way open to him. Militarily, he worked ceaselessly for the rearmament of Germany and Japan, and attempted repeatedly to provoke an armed conflict between the United States and China (Korea, the Formosa Straits, Indo-China) while China was still relatively weak, failing in the latter respect only because Truman and Eisenhower, together with the more cautious military leaders, feared desertion by allies and intervention by the Soviet Union. Economically, Dulles was the main architect of the far-reaching joint capitalist boycott of trade with the Soviet bloc. And politically, he waged war on numerous fronts, both through the traditional methods of diplomacy and through such agencies as the Voice of America and the Central Intelligence Agency. Above all, Dulles

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shunned with almost religious fervor any sort of contractual agreement to settle outstanding differences and relax tension. He would not countenance the recognition of the Peking government or allow it to assume China's seat in the UN; he spurned contact with East Germany and refused to sanction the Oder-Neisse Line as the boundary between Germany and Poland; he walked out of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indo-China and withheld America's signature from the agreements which ended the war in that country. With a few relatively minor exceptions, most notably the conclusion of a peace treaty with Austria, he consistently refused to recognize or accept the actual international situation which resulted from the vast upheavals of World War II and the Chinese Revolution, electing instead to preserve for the United States the fullest freedom to take any and all actions that might help to restore the *status quo ante*.

The question that now confronts us is this: Does Eisenhower's decision to hold talks and exchange visits with Khrushchev, a decision which Dulles resolutely and successfully opposed as long as he lived, signify a change in American foreign policy away from the basic lines laid down by Dulles?

We must, of course, beware of attempting to answer by citing official statements, proclamations, and the like. Americans have always been adept at saying one thing and doing the opposite, and there is no reason to suppose that we have lost our skill at this gentle game. Moreover, in foreign affairs, where questions of "face" and prestige are particularly important, there is every reason to suppose that a fundamental change of policy would be disguised as long as possible. In this connection, it may not be out of place to repeat what we said after the summit Geneva Conference of 1955. If there is to be a change in this country's international course, we argued, there are two possibilities: "(1) American policy can be explicitly changed as to both ultimate aims and chosen means, or (2) hitherto dominant purposes and methods can be retained at the ideological level while being largely ignored in practice." And we went on to say:

> The whole of American history, all our national traditions and habits of thought, strongly indicate that the second course is the one that is likely to be followed. A nation that can praise the Bill of Rights to the sky while energetically stamping out all manifestations of dissent can surely combine the ultimate objective of world domination with a practical policy of live and let live. What this means, in effect, is that the architects of United

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> States foreign policy may well go on proclaiming the untenability and unacceptability of the *status quo,* while in fact tacitly acquiescing in it as the basis of a *modus vivendi* with the socialist countries.

Since this seems to be as true today as it was four years ago, we are quite willing to apply a heavy rate of discount to Congressional resolutions proclaiming "Captive Nations Week," Nixon speeches to the American Legion promising that we will never accept the present state of affairs in Eastern Europe, and many other reiterations in high places of the familiar Dulles themes. We are not quite prepared to see in such pronouncements positive evidence of a new foreign policy, but we will agree that they cannot be taken as conclusive evidence on the other side either.

Unfortunately, however, we are not able to apply a similar rate of discount to Washington's major international *actions* in recent months. We discussed the German question in some detail in the June issue of MR and see no need to go over the same ground again so soon. But one very significant addition does need to be made. There is no more sensitive issue in East-West relations than the atomic armament of West Germany. At the same time, and for obvious reasons, it is a subject which American policymakers have been anxious to soft-pedal, so that no difficult-to-take-back public commitments have been entered into. Under the circumstances, we would expect that one of the first symptoms of any serious change in United States policy would be at the very least a slowing down of the preparations to turn West Germany into a nuclear power. In our view, therefore, it is all the more significant that the last three months have witnessed not a slowing down but a marked stepping up of these preparations. Agreements for training the forces of various NATO powers, including West Germany, in the use of nuclear weapons were before the Congress during most of the summer and could easily have been withdrawn or modified. No such action was taken by the Eisenhower administration. The agreements went into effect *after* announcement of the Khrushchev-Eisenhower exchange of visits. Dulles himself could hardly have planned it more provocatively.

During this same period a crucial test of United States policies and intentions has arisen in the Far East where the kingdom of Laos threatens to become another Korea. What lies behind this sudden eruption of a Laotian crisis at the very time when final preparations

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the Khrushchev-Eisenhower exchange were being completed? The answer is clear: a typical John Foster Dulles operation which, up to the time of writing at any rate, Washington seems determined to push to its logical conclusion in precisely the style and manner of the master provocateur himself. It will repay us to look into the Laotian situation in some detail.

First, a few facts about which there is no dispute. Prior to 1954 Laos and Cambodia were French protectorates which, together with Vietnam, constituted the colony of Indo-China. When the Indo-China war was brought to an end by the Geneva Agreements of the summer of 1954, the southern part of Laos was under the protectorate government while the two northern provinces of Samneua and Phongsaly were controlled by the Pathet Lao, an armed resistance movement similar in composition and with close ties to the Vietminh which governed North Vietnam and was one of the signers of the Geneva settlement. According to the terms of the latter, Laos and Cambodia were to become independent countries under their existing governments. In one respect, however, their international freedom of action was carefully limited: they were forbidden to join any kind of military alliance, and the amount and kinds of military aid they might receive from abroad in building up their own armed forces were prescribed. In short, the Geneva Agreements provided for the military neutralization of the two countries. In addition, however, there was the problem of the *de facto* division of Laos between the royal government and the Pathet Lao forces. In order to solve this, the Geneva Agreements established an international Commission consisting of representatives of Canada, Poland, and India, with the Indian as permanent chairman. The Commission was charged with the tasks of bringing the two sides together to unify the country and otherwise supervising the implementation of the terms of the settlement.

For a while everything went "according to plan." After long and difficult negotiations under the auspices of the international Commission, a political settlement between the royal government and the Pathet Lao was reached in November 1957. Provision was made for integrating the Pathet Lao fighting forces into the Laos army; the two northern provinces were taken over by the royal government; the Pathet Lao itself was reorganized as a regular political party; and elections were held in the northern provinces for 21 new seats added to the National Assembly. The Pathet Lao and a smaller neutralist

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

party together won 13 of these seats, and two Pathet Lao leaders, including Prince Souvanna Vong, were taken into the government. Laos thus became, as I. F. Stone points out in his latest *Weekly* (September 14), "the only country in the world which had succeeded in achieving national unity by our favorite American formula—unification by free elections."

Thereafter, however, the tide turned rapidly and the country moved uninterruptedly toward the state of civil war which now prevails. Following the elections, the international Commission, by a vote of 2-to-1 with Poland dissenting, adjourned *sine die*. Three days later, the Prime Minister, Prince Souvanna Phouma, half brother of the Pathet Lao leader, resigned and proceeded to form a new government without the Pathet Lao members. Subsequently, a more strongly anti-Communist government was organized under the leadership of the present Prime Minister, Phoui Sananikone. The Sananikone government moved vigorously to suppress the Pathet Lao forces. As described by Joseph Alsop, reporting from Laos in the *Herald Tribune* of September 9th, this is what happened: "The leading Communists [including Prince Souvanna Vong] were placed under arrest. In the provinces, the more flagrant terrorists [read: political activists] were summarily executed. The Communist-controlled units in the army were disarmed (but one of them got away and is now prominent in the fighting). The remaining machinery of Communist control in Phongsaly and Samneua was firmly dismantled." In a word: the reactionary forces in Laos, having jettisoned the international Commission, unleashed a violent counter-revolution. The inevitable result, in a country with Laos' primitive social structure and recent history, was the eruption of full-scale civil war. The Pathet Lao quickly reverted to the status of an armed resistance movement and quite naturally sought—and no doubt received—aid from its ideological allies in neighboring North Vietnam.

Why did events follow this particular course? What gave the leaders of Laotian reaction the courage to treat the Geneva Agreements as a mere scrap of paper, to stir up certain civil war against what was known to be a strong popular movement, and to risk the wrath of much more powerful neighbors?

This, of course, is where American policy enters the picture. The United States participated in the conference which drew up the Geneva Agreements, but Dulles refused to sign them and immediately set

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out to sabotage their implementation. The first step was the establishment in September 1954, of the South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO). A protocol attached to the treaty includes Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam in its provisions for defense against aggression or threats "other than by armed attack" (i.e. by domestic revolution), even though the three countries are not signatories of the pact. As Dana Adams Schmidt notes in a background story from Washington (*New York Times,* September 7): "That is the way John Foster Dulles, the late Secretary of State and father of this treaty, circumvented the Geneva Agreements of 1954, which stipulated that Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam should not join any military alliances." But Mr. Dulles's opposition to the Agreements was by no means confined to SEATO. As Schmidt reports in the same background story, "in the particular case of Laos it [the United States] first advised against an agreement, then advised putting the Communist cabinet ministers out, disarming the Communist units, and opening a determined anti-Communist campaign." Testimony to the same effect comes from Joseph Alsop, reporting from Laos in the *Herald Tribune* of September 6th: "The present non-Communist government of Laos was formed with the strongest American backing. Almost all its actions to repress the Communists in Laos were taken with American approval, and often as a result of American suggestions." To this Mr. Alsop adds the following extremely important revelations:

> These things were not done in Laos, either, without warnings to the Americans from Laotian leaders, from the Crown Prince-Regent downwards. They warned that abandonment of the former neutralist policy of Laos would provoke Communist aggression. These warnings were given to the American authorities here, to the present Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, J. Graham Parsons, and even to the U. S. Commander, Pacific, Adm. Harry D. Felt.
>
> For example, one of the most controversial steps the Laotian government has taken was to get rid of the International Control Commission created when Vietnam was partitioned at Geneva. Getting rid of the Commission, with its pro-Communist "impartial" Indian chairman, was a great gain, but also a most provocative step. Adm. Felt was consulted when he visited this country. He assured the Laotians that they could rely on the support of the United States and the protection of the South East Asia Treaty Organization.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> The same assurances were given to the Crown Prince-Regent and other Laotian leaders by Assistant Secretary of State Parsons and the American authorities here, at other points in the process of ridding Laos of Communist influence. The Laotian requests for a formal American guaranty of the territorial integrity of Laos were indeed refused. But the refusal in all cases was based on the argument that no such guaranty was needed, since American support and SEATO protection were sufficient to guard Laos against the dangers that Laotian leaders so correctly foresaw.

The implication of all this is unmistakable: ever since the general elections of 1958, which demonstrated the large and no doubt growing strength of the ex-Pathet Lao movement, the Laotian government has been a mere instrument of American policy. Without American prompting and promises of American protection, it is quite clear that Laotian reaction would never have dared to abandon the course of international neutrality and domestic conciliation laid down for the country by the Geneva Agreements. Further, on the sound principle that sane men must be assumed to intend the natural consequences of their acts, we can only conclude that the policy of Mr. Dulles and his colleagues in the State Department and the military was deliberately to provoke a situation in the Far East in which the United States would be under the strongest kind of pressure to use armed force against the Asian Communist countries. Laos thus takes its place in the long series of post-World War II efforts of the American war party to turn back the clock in Asia by military means.

It is true, of course, that the Laotian enterprise was planned and launched by Dulles personally and that matters were already far advanced by the time he left office. Hence the question which particularly concerns us can hardly be whether the whole thing has since been called off: such dramatic reversals of policy are not to be expected. What we should ask, rather, is whether there have been any signs at all of an attempt on the part of the administration to calm things down in Laos and at least to begin to find some way out of a very dangerous situation.

The answer, unfortunately, is not only that there have been no such signs but that, on the contrary, the logic of the Dulles policy has been vigorously and consistently pursued. As the situation in Laos deteriorated toward civil war—Mr. Alsop explicitly states that this process was well under way and fully understood by American officials

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as long ago as January—Washington continued to egg the Laotian government on and began to lay the groundwork for active United States military intervention. In July, an agreement was concluded between Washington and Vientiane providing for a large American military training mission. (According to a report in the *Wall Street Journal* of September 8th, total United States military and economic aid to Laos over the last five years has amounted to $225 million, but a large part of the military equipment thus supplied has "rotted into uselessness" through mishandling and neglect.) In August, it was announced by President Eisenhower himself that military aid was being sharply increased by airlift. And most recently, at the end of the first week of September, the Laotian government, obviously with the agreement if not at the actual instigation of the United States, appealed to the UN for military assistance. Things have been and still are moving in a manner which is ominously reminiscent of Korea.

Don't misunderstand us. We are not predicting that the outcome will be the same as in Korea, still less that a general Asian conflagration is likely to result from the Laotian crisis. Those who have the responsibility of making the ultimate decision for war or peace—and this means chiefly Eisenhower and before him Truman—have invariably stopped short of the last step, and often the next to the last step, on the course mapped out by the war party. With the military balance less favorable to the United States than ever before, there is every reason to assume that they will once again refuse to follow Mr. Dulles and his successors to the bitter and disastrous end. But this is essentialy irrelevant to the question with which we are here primarily concerned. That question is whether there has been any break with the main lines of foreign policy laid down by Dulles during his long term of office as Secretary of State. On the basis of the record in Laos, we can only reply with a sorrowful negative.

Must we then infer that the Eisenhower-Khrushchev visits and talks are doomed to failure?

We would not draw this conclusion. In one sense, indeed, they have already succeeded before they take place. They have relieved what was clearly becoming an unbearable state of tension over the Berlin issue. The war fears of earlier this year have not been dissipated, but they undoubtedly have been greatly allayed. The Geneva summit conference of 1955 performed a similar function and as long as the underlying international situation continues to be dominated

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the cold war and the arms race there will be a repeated need for similar dramatic meetings in the future. They may not settle anything, but they do drain off what may be called the "war potential" which builds up with inexorable force in the present international atmosphere, much as the electrical potential of the clouds builds up on a hot summer afternoon.

But to say that the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange constitutes a life-saving interruption of the drift to war—and in this sense is to be fervently welcomed—is very different from saying that it marks a fundamental change of American foreign policy, still less the end of the cold war, or for that matter even the beginning of the end of the cold war. For such things can never happen until the American ruling class, or at least a leadership which the American ruling class is willing to trust and follow, is ready to face up to and accept the world as it actually is, or, what comes to the same thing, to give up once and for all the chimerical idea that the international situation can be restored to what it was before World War II and the Chinese Revolution. Of such readiness there is as yet, unfortunately, no serious indication. John Foster Dulles no longer makes American policy. His body lies a-mouldering in the grave. But up to now at any rate all the evidence points to the conclusion that his soul goes marching on.

(September 15, 1959)

It seems quite clear from the experience of thousands of years that the only stable happiness for man lies in serving something nobler than the individual man and thereby denying that a man is no more than an organized collection of chemicals. The service of Mammon may make a tiny minority of exceptionally acquisitive individuals happy in a negative, anti-social way. It will hardly do for ordinary, decent people.

—Edward Hyams, *New Statesman,* March 28, 1959

I see with depressing clarity that neither things nor people can be changed —until the whole situation has changed. . . . That's how I see matters, but the chief thing is to keep your chin up and not get too excited about it. Our job will take years.

—*Rosa Luxemburg to Clara Zetkin, 1907*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARXISM AND PSYCHOANALYSIS

BY PAUL A. BARAN

My topic tonight is one which by profession I am hardly qualified to discuss. I am an economist, and my concern with psychoanalysis is only marginal. If nevertheless I am going to speak about "Marxism and Psychoanalysis," it is because as a social scientist and as a Marxist I have to consider the social process as a whole; I have to study the phenomena which play a major role in the social life of our time. And it is a fact which we should face squarely: psychoanalysis today exercises an influence which is probably more pervasive than that of any other doctrine or school of thought which contributes to the formation of our "collective mind." It would be instructive to poll this large audience and to find out how many came here tonight because Marxism appears in the announcement and how many because of their interest in psychoanalysis.

Ever since Marxism stepped upon the intellectual stage as a powerful effort to understand historical development, its most important bourgeois adversary has been what I may call "psychologism." Although appearing in different forms, assuming different guises, and presented in different terms, psychologism has always rested on two main pillars: first, the reduction of the social process to the behavior of the individual; and second, the treatment of the individual as governed by psychic forces deriving their strength from instincts which are considered to be deeply imbedded in "human nature," with "human nature" in turn constituting an essentially stable, biotically determined structure.

Gradually, in the light of far-reaching changes in the real world and of accumulating historical and anthropological knowledge, these concepts became increasingly untenable, and traditional psychologism was forced into the background. What took its place is a new version of psychologism: an amalgam of Freudian psychoanalysis and some quasi-Marxian, sociological notions—a doctrine which I propose to

This is the reworked transcript of the author's lecture delivered at the Tenth Anniversary meeting of MONTHLY REVIEW in New York on May 19, 1959. Paul Baran is Professor of Economics at Stanford University and the author of MR Press book *The Political Economy of Growth.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

call "socio-psychologism." This new arrival on the ideological scene distinguishes itself from its defunct predecessor by recognizing freely that the individual is not entirely a man for himself but is influenced by society, is somehow affected by the social setting within which he grows up. What is crucial, however, is that society in socio-psychologism is viewed as "environment": family, occupational stratum, interracial relations, residential community, and the like.

We must realize the implications of both positions. In the first, if it is "human nature" that determines the historical process, and if this "human nature" is unalterable, then all attempts to achieve a radical transformation of the human character and of the foundations of the social order are necessarily doomed to failure. In that case we might as well give up all hope for a society without exploitation of men by men, without injustice, without war, because all these things—exploitation, injustice, war—are the ineluctable result of the everlasting properties of the human animal. Encapsulated in his perennial "nature," man is eternally condemned to live down his original sin; he can never aspire to a free development in a society governed by humanism and reason. It hardly needs adding that what follows from these premises is a conservative or indeed a reactionary attitude towards all the burning issues of our time, an attitude close to the heart of the most "old-fashioned" elements of the ruling class.

Different conclusions emerge from socio-psychologism. For the proposition that human development is determined by the social "milieu" and depends on the nature of inter-personal relations—on conditions obtaining within the family and so forth—leads obviously to the conclusion that significant changes (improvements) in human existence can be brought about by suitable "adjustments" in the prevailing environment. More togetherness and love, more schools and hospitals, and more co-ops and family counseling services then become the appropriate response to the human predicament in our society.

As in the case of all ideologies, neither psychologism nor socio-psychologism is a mere hallucination wholly unrelated to the real world. Each reflects, albeit in a distorted, ideological manner, an aspect of the actual, existential condition of men in capitalist society. By enunciating a manifest lie—the sovereign power of the individual in our society—psychologism points unmistakably to the loneliness, unrelatedness, and impotence of men under capitalism, and thus comes nearer truth than the shallow liberal claptrap treating "us" as con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trolling and shaping our lives, or pontificating about national or even international "communities" determining their own destinies. Similarly, in raising the principle *homo homini lupus* to the status of an eternal verity, in considering man to be by nature a selfish, aggressive monad fighting ruthlessly for a place in the market, psychologism captures more of the capitalist reality than those doctrines which would have us believe that the character of the capitalist man can be changed by sanctimonious incantations concerning love, productivity, and the brotherhood of men. For, with exploitation, injustice, and war having molded for centuries the character of men, treating the existing human species as a formidable rock not easily displaced or transformed is undoubtedly more appropriate than the view of the superficial meliorist who would reshape human attitudes by intensified preaching, by larger federal grants-in-aid to education, by strengthening the Pure Food and Drug Administration, or by electing a Democratic President.

Socio-psychologism, too, mirrors important aspects of our society. By uncovering the horrors of our culture—the dismal state of our educational system, the misery of our cities, the abominable "climate" in which Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, and unemployed whites live in this country—socio-psychologism is nearer the realities of capitalism than the enthusiastic celebrators of free and unhampered private enterprise. At the same time, by attributing this social condition to "our" lack of enlightenment, to "our" incapacity for purposeful action, to the power of "conventional wisdom," and to similar psychic "facts," it expresses the refusal to see the fundamental causes of the existing malaise, a refusal that constitutes the characteristic and indeed decisive element of the ruling ideology. Moreover, the insistence of socio-psychologism on the curability of all of these ills by means of various and sundry "adjustments" is part and parcel of the spirit of manipulation in which the Big Business executive "fixes" the problems confronting his corporation by such methods as establishing recreation facilities for his workers, or appropriating more money for market research or advertising, or by initiating some fancy product variation. Thus socio-psychologism becomes one of the most important components—if not *the* most important component—of the ideology of monopoly capitalism which seeks to find ways of eliminating the most crying irrationalities, the most conspicuous injustices of the capitalist system in order to preserve and to strengthen its basic institutions.

But to realize and to unveil the ideological nature of both psy-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chologism and socio-psychologism is only one part of what needs to be done. Even this job can be adequately performed only if the differences between the two doctrines are clearly understood, and if this ideological development is carefully analyzed as a reflection (and an aspect) of the transformation of the underlying economic, social, and political reality itself. Yet, as in the case of most problems posed by the emergence and evolution of monopoly capitalism, Marxism has been seriously remiss in coping with this matter. Failing to distinguish between old-fashioned psychologism and its modern, more sophisticated offshoot, Marxists, both in the West and in the USSR, have been seeking to refute the latter by employing arguments applicable only to the former. This has been particularly tempting since marshalling the arguments called for little effort: all of them are readily available in the works of Marx and Engels, as well as in the writings of later Marxists.

Even more serious is that another, equally important part of the Marxist commitment has been left unattended to. This is the separation of the wheat from the chaff, the distillation of whatever genuine scientific insights may be submerged in the ideological flood of socio-psychologism. For to the development of Marxism nothing is more essential than the systematic identification and absorption of such scientific advances as are attained by bourgeois scholarship—accompanied by relentless unmasking and debunking of its manifold ideological ingredients.

Thus in dealing with psychoanalysis—a doctrine which is the mainstay of socio-psychologism and which differs significantly from earlier theories underlying psychologism—Marxists have taken the position that all of it is nothing but ideology void of scientific content. This attitude has been based to a large extent on the notion that Freud's abiding concern with the irrational underpinnings of the conduct of men is tantamount to glorification of irrationality, to its elevation to the status of the ultimate, inexplicable, irreducible determinant of human activity. If such had been Freud's view, there would be little indeed to distinguish him from all and sundry philosophers of romanticism and existentialism. Yet although Freud undoubtedly had strong tendencies in that direction—particularly apparent in some of his later writings—the bulk of his work is inspired by a different intention. Having recognized what is undisputable—that irrationality governs a large part of human behavior—Freud directed most of his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

life's effort to an attempt at a *rational* understanding of irrational motivations. Far from considering irrationality to be an elemental phenomenon inaccessible to scientific analysis, Freud sought to develop a comprehensive theory providing a *rational* explanation of irrational drives.

To be sure, this ambitious goal remained beyond Freud's reach. Nevertheless, he took the matter further than anyone before him, and—I might add—anyone after him, even if he did fail to arrive at a satisfactory concept of human conduct. And just as Marxism has been the heir and the guardian of what is most valuable and progressive in bourgeois culture, so it is incumbent upon Marxism today to take up Freud's work where Freud left it, and to turn his insights to good use in the elaboration of a rational theory of human activity.

I submit that only Marxism is able to fulfill this task. For the Marxian theory of social dynamics sheds penetrating light on the factors principally determining human behavior. What is needed is to revive some of the central—albeit neglected—strands in Marxian thought, and to focus them on the problem at hand. While this claim of mine cannot be fully substantiated in a short lecture, I would like to attempt a "telegram-style" outline of the relevant considerations.

It is fundamental to the Marxian approach to the study of man that there is no such thing as an eternal, invariant "human nature." With due regard for what can be considered biotic constants, the character of man is the product of the social order in which he is born, in which he grows up, and the air of which he inhales throughout his life; it is its result and indeed one of its most significant aspects. Yet it is of the utmost importance to understand that what is meant by "social order" in Marxian theory is at most only a distant cousin of the notion of "society" as employed in socio-psychologism. The latter, it will be recalled, refers to "environment," to "inter-personal relations," and to similar aspects of what constitutes the *surface* of social existence. The former, on the other hand, encompasses the attained stage of the development of productive forces, the mode and relations of production, the form of social domination prevailing at any given time, all together constituting the *basic* structure of the existing social organization. Changes of the social order (in the Marxian understanding of that term), radical and shattering as they always are, have taken centuries to mature and have occured only a few times in the course of history. Correspondingly, changes in the nature of man have also proceeded

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at a glacial pace; while assuming tremendous proportions if looked at in full historical perspective, they have been all but imperceptible in the lifespan of entire generations. Still it is a fallacy to mistake the slowness of change in the character of man for its absence. This error leads to psychologism and to the belief in the everlasting sameness of the human species. And it is no less fallacious to deduce from the existence of change its rapidity. This error in turn leads to socio-psychologism and to the illusion that human beings can be "remodeled" by persuasion or by some repair jobs within the existing social order, that they can be manipulated into something different from what that social order has made them.

Thus a proper analysis of human motivations and conduct must refer to a timespan shorter than that of psychologism but longer than that of socio-psychologism. It has to avoid the a-historical frozenness of the former while escaping at the same time the newspaper-headline orientation of the latter. And it must consider human development in its true context: the economic and social order determining the content and molding the profile of the relevant historical epoch. Accordingly the exploration of the human character can neither rely on empty abstractions such as "man in general" nor gain much insight from an ever-so-careful examination of spurious concretes such as the "other-directed personality," the "trade-union man," the "chamber of commerce man," or the "man in the gray flannel suit." At the present time and in this country, the object of the investigation is the human being born with certain inherited characteristics and reared as a member of a class in capitalist society or—more specifically—in capitalist society's most advanced stage, the reign of monopoly capital.

This suggests that—leaving biology aside—the first step of such an investigation has to be directed toward the understanding of the basic factors determining human existence under the prevailing social order. Outstanding among these factors is the vast expansion of society's productive resources. Based on a spectacular intensification of the subjugation of nature (including human nature) by society, this growth of productivity has promoted (and has been promoted by) a tremendous increase of rationality in the productive process as well as in the mental habits of men. Yet it is inherent in the capitalist order, and indeed its most striking characteristic, that this advance in rationality has proceeded in a complex and contradictory fashion. It has been primarily an advance of *partial* rationality and has remained es-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sentially confined to segments of the social fabric, to its particular units and aspects. Thus the efficiency of industrial and agricultural enterprises, the rationality of their administration, of their cost and price and profit calculations, as well as of their efforts to manipulate the market, have reached unprecedented dimensions. But this increase in *partial* rationality has not been accompanied by a corresponding growth of *total* rationality, of rationality in the overall organization and functioning of society. In fact, the total rationality of the social order has declined; the disparity between partial and total rationality has been growing increasingly pronounced. This can be fully realized if one thinks of the contrast between the automated, electronically controlled factory and the economy as a whole with its millions of unemployed and other millions of uselessly employed people; if one considers the efficiency with which redundant chrome and fins are being affixed to unfunctional automobiles; or if one contemplates the palatial office towers, planned and equipped according to the last word of science, in which highly skilled employees devise the most effective methods for the promotion of a new soap, standing next to squalid slums in which families of five vegetate in one dilapidated filthy room. But the abyss dividing the parts from the whole is most horrifying if one places next to each other the breathtaking productive power harnessed in the energy of the atom, and the death, the misery, the human degradation, that mark the existence of the great majority of mankind subsisting in the underdeveloped countries.

The basic reason for this glaring cleavage between partial and total rationality, between the rising "know how," and the declining "know what," is the alienation of man from his means of production, an alienation that has become increasingly marked throughout the history of capitalism and is strongly accentuated in its current monopolistic phase. Indeed the concentration of the means of production in the hands of a small group of oligarchs—responsible to no one but themselves and to their everlasting commitment to keep increasing their profits—who smoothly and rationally preside over their corporate empires has completed the fixation of the productive apparatus as a power outside and above the individual, a power dominating his existence but entirely inaccessible to his control. And at no time in history has this power over the vast and growing productive forces been to such an extent power over life and death of millions of men, women, and children everywhere.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the most insidious, and at the same time the most portentous, aspect of this overwhelming power of the objectified productive relations over the life of the individual is their capacity to determine decisively his psychic structure. For the conflict between total and partial rationality not only sets the tone of the entire capitalist culture; it also sinks deeply into the mentality of the human being brought up in and molded by the all-pervasive institutions, values, and habits of thought which make up that culture. The exigencies of the productive process call for the development of an increasingly well trained, literate, and intelligent manpower. Earning a livelihood at the conveyer belt, in the office, or in the sales force of the modern corporation depends on the possession of rational attitudes and aptitudes greatly superior to what was required at an earlier, less advanced stage of capitalist development. Much of the work that used to be guided by authority, tradition, and intuition is now based on scientifically established procedures and accurate measurements. Yet, as stressed above, this highly rationalized effort is directed towards largely irrational ends; the individual worker is not only unconcerned with the outcome of the productive process in which he plays an infinitesimal part but this outcome has no meaning and no purpose; it cannot inform his activity with the knowledge of aim or with the pride of accomplishment.

This incessantly reproduced clash between what might be called "micro-sense" and "macro-madness" is, however, only one part of the story. The other, even more important, aspect is the profound impact of the lack of total rationality upon the dynamics and nature of partial rationality itself. I must therefore amend what I said above about the achievements in regard to partial rationality. For reason is indivisible, and the irrationality of the whole cannot coexist harmoniously with the rationality of the parts. The one continually threatens the other, and their antagonism expresses one of the profound contradictions of the capitalist system. Whereas the irrationality of the whole must be constantly maintained if exploitation, waste, and privilege, if—in one word—capitalism is to survive, the rationality of society's individual parts is enforced by the drive for profits and the competitive necessities of capitalist enterprise. Thus this partial rationality continually edges forward—albeit jerkily and unevenly—but the advance takes place at the cost of its being warped, perverted, and corrupted by the irrationality of the surrounding social order. As a result, such progress as has been attained is far from uniform. Some of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it constitutes genuine steps forward in the rational comprehension of the world and in the development of the forces of production. This applies to much of what has been accomplished in such areas as mathematics and natural sciences, as well as in certain branches of historical research. Elsewhere, however, what parades as an increase in rationality is frequently nothing but the amplification and propagation of business "know how," of the rationality of the capitalist market. There the intellectual effort which takes market relations for granted is exclusively directed towards manipulation in the interest of corporate enterprise. What it promotes is "practical intelligence," the capacity to make the best of a given market constellation, to maximize one's advantages in the struggle of all against all. Thus, important parts of physics and chemistry have been pressed into the service of war and destruction; much mathematical and statistical ingenuity has been turned into an auxiliary of monopolistic market control and profit maximization; psychology has become a prostitute of "motivation research" and personnel management; biology is made into a handmaiden of pharmaceutical rackets; and art, language, color, and sound have been degraded into instrumentalities of advertising.

Under such circumstances human rationality inevitably becomes crippled, and its advance is pushed into a direction that bears no relation to the prerequisites for, and the needs of, human health, happiness, and development. If the compulsion to take *anything* for granted is a fetter on the expansion and perfection of men's capacity to reason and to understand, the oppressive and stifling function of that fetter grows in proportion to the irrationality of what men are brought up not to question but to accept as a datum. True, taking capitalism for granted when it was an essentially progressive social order interfered relatively little with (or even promoted) the development of partial rationality. By the same token, however, the necessity not to scrutinize but to treat as part of the natural order of things the regime of monopoly capital, along with all the waste and all the destruction that go with it, constitutes a straitjacket within which reason cannot but suffocate. Thus the clash between partial and total rationality becomes complicated and aggravated by the no less violent conflict between reason and the debasement of reason which dominates the sphere of partial rationality itself.

This condition has manifold psychological ramifications to only two of which I can now attempt to draw your attention. First, such

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rationality as prevails solidifies itself into a system of rules, procedures, and habits of thought that not only does not further the satisfaction of human needs but becomes a formidable obstacle to human development and, indeed, survival. As bourgeois rationality turns increasingly into the rationality of domination, exploitation, and war, the ordinary man revolts against this obstruction to his aspirations for peace, happiness, and freedom. Yet, afflicted with "common sense" that is studiously nurtured by all the agencies of bourgeois culture and the principal injunction of which is to take capitalist rationality for granted, he can hardly avoid identifying the rationality of buying, selling, and profit-making with reason itself. His revolt against capitalist rationality, against the rationality of markets and profits, thus becomes a revolt against reason itself, turns into anti-intellectualism, and promotes aggressiveness toward those who manage to capitalize on the rules of the capitalist game to their advantage and advancement. It renders him an easy prey of irrationality.

Irrationality and aggressiveness in our time are, therefore, not emanations of some unalterable human instincts. Nor do they express simply the supposedly "natural" rejection of *reason*. Irrationality and aggressiveness in our time reflect primarily the refusal to accept as sacrosanct the rationality of capitalism. They testify to the protest against the mutilation and degradation of reason for the sake of capitalist domination. This outcry against bourgeois rationality, as well as its identification with reason as such, is magnificently depicted in Dostoevsky's Underground Man who "vomits up reason" and who scornfully rejects the commandment to accept the proposition that two times two equals four. While this strikingly exemplifies the posture of irrationalism, an important aspect of the Underground Man's attitude should not be lost sight of. It is that the Underground Man, irrational and "crazy" as he is, is actually profoundly *right* in "vomiting up reason," in refusing to bow to the logic of two times two equals four. For this logic *is* the logic of the capitalist market, of the exploitation of man by man, of privileges, insecurity, and war. To be sure, his contempt for *this* rationality, his uprising against the "common sense" of human misery, is an irrational reaction to a pernicious social order. But it is the only reaction available to the isolated and helpless individual who, incapable of comprehending the forces by which he is being crushed, is unable to struggle effectively against them. This reaction is neurosis.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Secondly, as I mentioned in passing earlier, the development of the forces of production and the advance of rationality with which it has been associated were based on a tremendous intensification of human domination over nature. The result of this harnessing of natural resources to the needs of men has been a momentous rise in the output of goods, services, health, and literacy—combined with a spectacular lightening of the burden of human toil. Yet this advance was achieved not merely by the expansion of human control over the objects and energies of the outside world; it was based on a perhaps even more radical subjugation of the nature of man himself. This subjugation has two separate, if closely interconnected, aspects. In the pre-capitalist era, it involved the emergence and development of the domination and exploitation of man by man. Extracting from the underlying population varying quantities of economic surplus, the dominating and exploiting classes used this economic surplus to assure their privileged positions in society, at the same time directing larger or smaller shares of the surplus to investment in productive facilities or to the maintenance of military, religious, and cultural establishments. Applied to those days, however, the expression "surplus" is a euphemism. With productivity and output rising only very slowly, the condition had not yet been attained in which the consumption of the ruling class and its outlays on productive investment and on religious and military and other purposes could be based upon a genuine sufficiency of goods and services for the people. Sheer violence and elaborate systems of political enforcement always played a major role in the process of extraction of the requisite resources. Yet neither would have been able to fulfill this task had it not been for the development and propagation of religious, legal, moral—in one word: ideological—notions which sanctified the ruling classes' claims to their appropriations and which were turned in the course of centuries into a comprehensive network of internalized thoughts, beliefs, fears, and hopes, compelling the people to recognize the rights and to heed the demands of their rulers.

A new chapter was opened by the advent of the capitalist order. Now the human being had to go through a further process of "adjustment." To the qualities cultivated in the wood-hewers and water-carriers of old had to be added a new and all-important characteristic, that of rationality. For now it was no longer sufficient to be an obedient and selfless serf or a cruel and rapacious squire; what was required

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

henceforth was a diligent, docile, efficient, and reliable worker in a rationalized, streamlined, profit-maximizing capitalist enterprise. This enforced what is probably one of the most far-reaching transformations of "human nature" experienced thus far. If in the course of preceding history man had been made submissive by exploitation and domination, the working principles of the capitalist order demanded that he should acquire the ability to calculate and the habit of acting with forethought and deliberation. What was left of his elemental emotionality, of his spontaneity, after having been disciplined for centuries by the whip of his titled overlords, came now under the much more systematic, much more comprehensive pressure of the callously and accurately calculating market.

As deliberateness in the business of earning a living—and in all other aspects of life as well—became the prerequisite for survival in capitalist society, spontaneity came to be disdained and feared not only as a source of disruption of the production routine but as a threat to the stability of the class-dominated and exploitative social order. From the very beginning of the capitalist era it was accordingly exposed to a withering fire of economic sanctions and social opprobrium, and the assault against it was mounted simultaneously by the entire apparatus of bourgeois ideology and culture, including such divergent components as Christian religion and the utilitarian philosophy. And in capitalism's current, monopolistic, phase this attack has multiplied in scope and intensity. Just as human relations in corporate empires came by necessity to be attuned to "making friends and influencing people," so has love been "streamlined" into a scientifically approved means of securing medically indicated sexual gratification, while beauty is identified with the precise measurements of Miss America, and nature, music, literature, and art are valued in exact proportion to their serving as purveyors of "relaxation." Not that the campaign against spontaneity was ever decided upon or directed by some executive committee of capitalist elders, although attributing to Marxism such a view of the matter has long been the stock in trade of professional Marx-refuters whose ignorance of Marxism is exceeded only by their incapacity to understand it. The implacable hostility toward spontaneity and the powerful tendency toward its suppression are rather the inherent characteristics of a mode of production based on commodity exchange and unfolding within a system of relations of production, domination, and exploitation. Far from being a pre-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meditated, well-planned stratagem of the ruling class, calculated to repress the drives and aspirations of the underlying population, both the ascent of deliberateness and the decay of spontaneity affected the members of the ruling class itself and turned them in the course of time into unhappy beneficiaries of an unhappy society.

The crux of the matter, it seems to me, is that market-oriented deliberateness and market-induced suppression of spontaneity, "adjusting" the privileged and the underprivileged alike to the requirements of the capitalist system, fatally damage what Freud, and before him Marx and Engels, identified as the sources of human happiness: freedom of individual development and the capacity to experience sensual gratifications. Putting a severe tabu on the individual's emotionality and channeling what is left of it into an aggressiveness which is disciplined and directed toward the attainment of success and the elimination of rivals in the competitive struggle, they produce "affect-crippledness"—to use an expression of Freud—and generate the phenomenon which was put into its proper theoretical context by Marx in his concept of the alienation of man from himself. This alienation of man from himself—the maiming of the individual, the subjugation of his nature to the needs of capitalist enterprise, the mortal wounding of his spontaneity, and the molding of his personality into a self-seeking, deliberate, calculating, and circumspect participant in (and object of) the capitalist process—represents the basic framework within which the psychic condition of men evolves in capitalist society.

It is only within this framework that I can see a promise of a genuine understanding of psychic disturbances in our time. As I mentioned earlier, achieving such an understanding was not given to psychoanalysis. To be sure, Freud's identification of sexual malfunctioning as the principal source of psychic disorder represented a major advance in psychological thought. But what Freud's theoretical structure fails to provide—all assurances and appearances to the contrary notwithstanding—is a satisfactory explanation of the sexual malfunctioning itself. Not that Freud was unaware of this weakness of his doctrine, but it was in attempting to fill this crucially important gap that his efforts were least successful. It was here that he sought to find refuge either in psychologism or in socio-psychologism: either in a concept of a biotically unchanging human nature with equally unchanging intra-family relations as symbolized in the ancient Oedipus legend; or in surface observations referring to habits of child rearing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and of sexual enlightenment. Neither of these approaches enabled him to solve the central issue confronting psychology at the present time: the specification of the part played by more or less invariant biological factors in the determination of the psychic structure of men, and the analysis of the profound impact upon the human psyche exercised by the alienation of man from himself in the society of monopoly capitalism.

Marxists, impressed by the momentous accomplishments of Pavlov and his school, have focused attention on the former aspect of the matter and have tended—paradoxically enough—to sidestep Marx's revolutionary contribution to psychology: the sociology of the psyche. Still, while there can be no dispute about the importance of physiological factors in governing human behavior, it is indispensable to recognize the vast extent to which the economic and social order of capitalism and the process of alienation which it generates mold the psychic and, indeed, the physical functioning of men in the capitalist era. For it is impossible to understand sexual malfunctioning apart from the capitalism-caused atrophy of spontaneity; it is impossible to understand the shrinking capacity to experience sensual gratifications of any kind apart from the capitalism-generated proliferation of deliberateness, selfishness, and aggressiveness. I would go further and say that it is impossible to comprehend human activity in our society except as an outcome of a dialectic interaction of biotic forces and the working principles of monopoly capitalism, with the latter dominating, subjugating, and directing the former. And it is crucially important to recognize the nature of this interaction of the determinants of human existence under capitalism, because it is the powerful dynamism of the social and economic order which points to the location of the strategic leverage which in fullness of time will shift the historical gears and orient the development of man towards a fuller realization of his physical, emotional, and rational capacities. This leverage is to be found neither in tranquilizing pills nor in "social adjustments," nor in the preaching of love of productivity and of "meeting of minds." This leverage must be found in the establishment of a more rational, more human society, and conversely in the abolition of a social order based upon the domination and exploitation of man by man. Not that socialism would change the situation "overnight." Expecting the liquidation of the centuries-old legacy of capitalism within a relatively short—if ever so eventful—period of transition reflects the attitude of socio-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

psychologism, which is as fallacious in this case as it is in others. Thus it is by no means an accident that those who hold the views of socio-psychologism are among the severest critics of the existing socialist societies: censuring sharply the Soviet Union or even China for not having yet abolished the alienation of man, and for not having yet created the socialist individual. It hardly needs stressing that demanding such impossible changes amounts to demanding no changes at all; that stipulating the immediate realization of what can develop only slowly on the basis of vast institutional transformations as a condition for the participation in the struggle for a better society is tantamount to deserting this struggle altogether.

A few concluding remarks: what I have said so far is not meant to suggest that there may be no possibility of individuals who are ill finding a measure of relief through currently available means of psychiatric treatment. The frequently reiterated observation that the degree of success attained in psychotherapy is largely independent of the school of psychological thought to which the therapist adheres, but is rather determined by the skill and personality of the physician and the amount of attention given by him to the patient, suggests the absence of any well-founded theory underlying psychotherapeutic practice. Moreover, psychotherapy's relative success in dealing with isolated symptoms of nervous disorder and the generally admitted failure of its efforts at curing character neurosis would tend to confirm the earlier expressed view that the phenomena underlying character neurosis are inaccessible to treatment on the individual plane. Indeed, the insistence on the possibility of altering character structures on the individual plane, of "producing" a healthy, well-functioning, and happy individual in our society is in itself an ideology. It tears asunder individual and society, it ignores the alienation of man under capitalism, and it represents a capitulation to socio-psychologism. It obscures the painful but ineluctable truth that the limits to the cure of man's soul are set by the illness of the society in which he lives.

We do not serve each other by competing in fear and fury for bread and power. The only political idea which rejects this vile and degrading competition in favor of cooperating and sharing, which, in Christian terms, rejects hatred of the neighbors as a way of life and replaces it by love of them, is Socialism.

—Edward Hyams, *New Statesman*, March 28, 1959

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NO SILVER PLATTER

BY VINCENT HALLINAN

Prior to World War II, progressives were concerned whether the lone socialist state could survive in a capitalist world. The latter's active and dangerous hostility made the problem more complex than the logic of history should provide. There was fear that the new order might be choked off before it could demonstrate its superiority. As that threat receded and the viability of the Soviet system was assured, the converse of the question was sometimes proposed as a happy but preposterous thought. With the dramatic shift in the preponderance of forces following World War II, it becomes a practical problem. We ask seriously how long *the* capitalist country can preserve its peculiar institution in a socialist world.

We are not concerned with countries in proximity to the socialist bloc which have had revolutionary proletariats for a century or more, nor with those in which starvation and despair provide tinder for any kind of explosion. We are talking about the United States of America, the very stronghold of the old system, and we must take into account its peculiar and individual characteristics.

The most important of these is the nature of its ruling class. It is no tag-end of a decadent aristocracy nor a wearied and frustrated bourgeoisie. It is greedy, acquisitive, and ruthless, but it is also competent and tough. It is also alert to its dangers. It completely controls the organs of government and the means of mass communication. No one believes that it can be wheedled out of its power and privileges. At this moment, its chief concern is to shore up the system which protects it. As part of this project, it must insulate the American people from any notions which might lead to the system's replacement, that is to say from infection by socialist influences.

Despite the rapid tempo of the modern world, it is not unlikely that the American ruling class may succeed in this purpose for a long time to come.

Anyone who thinks that socialism will be presented to the Ameri-

---

Presidential Candidate of the Progressive Party in 1952, Vincent Hallinan is now Chairman of United Socialist Action.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can people on a silver platter is kidding himself. The contradictions of capitalism and the pressure of outside events might bring it about when the seventh generation shall have passed over Jordan, but if socialism is to be introduced in the foreseeable future it will be because it has been worked and fought for with energy and tenacity.

This might be learned from a consideration of the fate of preceding economic systems. Each had its period of dominance and was replaced as its successor achieved greater efficiency in the production and distribution of goods. However, the displacement was never sudden nor complete. Tribal economies persisted right through feudalism and are still to be found in the midst of capitalist and even socialist systems. Feudalism still plays a considerable role on the human stage.

Those who see an early transition to socialism in America customarily base their belief upon the obvious fact that capitalism cannot successfully compete with socialism. But competition is not the road to survival: none of the preceding systems could have survived "in competition" with their successors. Where they tried to do so they were destroyed. The price of their survival was retreat. The conditions for continued existence were an inferior status, isolation, or subservience. Take, for example, the feudal institutions of the Near East. It is difficult to reconcile their degraded condition with the military and intellectual brilliance which dominated half the known world in the Middle Ages. Similarly, the inhabitant of an American Indian reservation bears little resemblance to his ancestor of lion bearing and falcon glance. These relics are an end-product, not arrived at in a fortnight. The loss of status was gradual.

Today, capitalism, all over the world, is following in the footsteps of its predecessors. It, too, is in retreat. Its leaders have studied history, which is now a science and not a collection of tales. They have learned their lessons. They are not "competing" with the new order. They appear to be doing so, but it is only pretense. They talk fight but don't mean it. The struggle is no longer for victory but only for survival. They are not courting a showdown. They know it would be fatal. If the feudal barons of the Southern states had not precipitated one by seceding from the Union, they might today have their overt feudalism and human slavery. A showdown finished the same institution in China, as well as the capitalisms of a dozen other nations.

The ruling class in the United States is accepting defeat and its mementos are everywhere around us. It still talks about dynamic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capitalism, but where is the dynamic? Our industrial plant is operating at 65 percent of capacity; 4 or 5 million unemployed is the normal condition; foreign trade (that is to say, the disposal of surplus commodities) is declining; floods destroy the land and inflation the wealth, and nothing is done to arrest them; cynicism and apathy are widespread. Ballistic experts imported from Germany make a show of matching the Soviets' planetary achievements, but nobody believes them. The government pretends to be concerned with inflation and calls for campaigns to fight it. At once, everybody dumps his bonds and starts speculating in common stocks. Social programs are abandoned; crime, delinquency, alcoholic and narcotic addiction increase. Even our boasted physical superiority is gone: the Soviets have 72 of the world amateur championships; we have 12; nobody cares.

What remedies are proposed? You can read them on the billboards: "Go to Church!" "Pray!"

Here are frustration, stagnation, decay.

American capitalism is in retreat. Its retrograde movement is irregular but deliberate. Several years ago, Herbert Hoover, whose acuteness as its High Priest has been underestimated, promulgated its strategy: "We must withdraw," he said, "from Europe and Asia and retire behind the Gibraltar of the Americas."

At the time of its utterance this program might have been possible; recent events in Central and South America indicate that it may no longer be so. Nevertheless, a program in that direction is the basis upon which the capitalist system can continue to survive in the United States. To effect this, the nation must abandon its advanced positions; it must relinquish its pretensions to "world leadership"; it must become insular and isolationist. For awhile it can sustain itself by devouring the other capitalisms and its own fat. Ultimately, it must live off the bone and sinew of American workers.

How long can it continue to do so?

The United States is an island; its inhabitants are removed from contamination by socialist neighbors. All the media of mass communication will pour upon them a storm of slander and invective against socialism and communism, just as they have been doing for years. Those who should champion socialism are defaulting the fight. They say: "Socialism is not in the mainstream of American thought," and feel under no obligation to put it there. Right now, there is nothing wrong in America which socialism wouldn't cure, but a 24-hour-a-day

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

campaign goes on to convince the American people that it is the worst of evils.

Given the sagacity of our ruling class, a revolutionary situation in this country is not within reasonable perspective. People are creatures of habit and relinquish customs with reluctance. As the Declaration of Independence points out, "mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right them by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed." Much is sacrificed to tradition. It took an iron dictatorship to get the Russian peasants out of their pigsties so that the Bolsheviks could inaugurate proper agricultural practices. The peasants sabotaged their crops and starved millions, including themselves. Near East Moslems are persuaded that their rags and lice are preferable to communism since the latter might disturb their religious prejudices. Americans bore the depression of the 1930s without seeking to alter the system which produced it. The most they did was change its managers.

The coming decline in our standard of living will be by easy gradations. It is already expressed in such phrases as: "We must tighten our belts," "We must sacrifice to defeat inflation," and the like. The real wages of workers will be lowered by devaluation of the currency and similar devices. If they get a bit dangerous they will be placated by concessions within the framework of the system and their more reliable leaders will be taken into the government. Methods have been perfected within the last decade for taking care of dissidents. Judicial, social, and economic pressures are available against them.

If one had set out forty years ago to pick the nations least likely to succeed in a program of scientific and industrial development, one would probably have come up with China and Russia. Today, their tremendous achievements are well known or can be made so. If the Americans, with their educated personnel, developed techniques, and enormous industrial plant would substitute a cooperative for a competitive system, they would dazzle the world. Especially the young people should be urged to join the renaissance of human achievement which is the glory of our generation, instead of wasting their lives in a wolfish struggle of man against man.

If they do not make such an effort and continue it, or if it should fail, then we will ask again: How long can *the* capitalist country preserve its system in a socialist world? A hundred years? Could be!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOCIALIST GALLUPS: OPINION SURVEYS BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

BY EVE MERRIAM

In the United States, we thrive upon questionnaires. Around the clock, over the telephone, in the street, at factory gate, office, and farm, the interviewers pounce, checking our likes and dislikes in strained versus whole cranberries, pajama tops versus bottoms, cigar-smoking versus filter-tipped Presidential candidates.

We are accustomed to the scrutiny of our chamber habits and to the inflation of trivia into solemn pronunciamentos: after all, are we for private enterprise or are we not? The symbol of our American hour is the television actor in the white laboratory jacket, extending to us a pill or tube or packet, confidently proclaiming, "Impartial public opinion test proves Boom-Busters are best."

Not all our polling takes place on such a tilted level, of course. University departments, civic institutions, and philanthropic foundations continue to grant funds for serious surveys that provide a base of operations for the social sciences. The trend, however, is for more and more of our trained personnel to be plucked up by the highest Batton-Barton bidder and sent down into a bathysphere to do motivation research for the marketplace.

Still and all, we are told, under another form of government there would be no lines of inquiry sent out whatever. In the socialist system, we are told, theirs not to fill out any questionnaire, theirs but to obey the great Russian bear.

But the lines are not quite so clearly drawn. For the past eighteen months, a Center for Public Opinion has been operating in Poland. It is the only such institution in the East European world. Is this a "revisionist" departure from the Soviet orbit, or might it be an indication of more open inquiry to come in other socialist countries? What kind of public opinion are they sampling: are the subjects prefabricated to produce stereotyped "correctly Communist" responses?

Just returned from a visit to East Europe, Eve Merriam has been awarded a special grant from CBS to write poetic drama for television. She is the author of a number of books of poetry and biography.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These questions were uppermost in my mind when I met recently in Warsaw with two of the sociologists who head the Osrodek Badania Opinii Publicznej.

Professor Rykevich and Professor Shaletsky were eager to discuss their work, apologetic about the scope of operations compared to American standards. It is evident that they are only beginning to make a beginning; that their sampling is anything but wide-scale; that some of their projects are far too ambitious even for an advanced, long-established network of institutions. Most appalling of all, they are dependent (at least for the time being) upon a corps of untrained volunteers who work for the Center outside of their regular laboring hours—which are lengthy enough. How can they possibly overcome such handicaps?

A few of the handicaps they see as beneficial. Take their survey on "The Social Functions of Television," for instance. Television itself in Poland is in its one-channel infancy. So much the better for us, they insist; we can, by our inquiries into public tastes and opinions now, help formulate plans for the future, before programming gets set into a rigid mold. It is difficult not to be impressed by such youthful optimism.

The heavy-set graying-haired director of the Center turns to the interpreter and urges, before we embark upon a breakdown of their surveys, that their position be made clear. Although the Center is located within the quarters of the government radio, they have no official connection. It is a matter of physical housing. The Center is attached to no other organ. It was started informally by several sociologists in the beginning of 1958. The first surveys were completely experimental; practical activities have been conducted now for a little more than a year. Eventually, it is planned that the Center will be linked to the Polish Academy of Sciences as an Institute.

His colleague interrupts. "We are not completely independent. One large survey we are undertaking now is being done under the auspices of a Youth Organization." He frowns. "That presents a danger, as it always does when you are cooperating with someone who pays for the survey."

I glance at him sharply: is he launching anti-American propaganda, being sarcastic about our heavily-sponsored commercial surveys? It's all right for me to criticize my own family, I feel, but let strangers keep their polite distance. Obviously no slight is intended;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he is uaware of my inner reactions and goes directly on to explain the basis of their polling.

They prepare analogous, but slightly differing forms for urban and rural areas. In prewar Poland, 70 percent of the population lived on farms; today, with the many industrialization projects under way, the proportion of city to village is nearly half and half.

How are the surveys conducted? Not by telephone, and rarely by mail. Personal interviewers are tested to see if they are discreet and tolerant. Responses are all kept anonymous; material is retained at the Center and not permitted to go outside—although results are published in economic, scientific, and cultural periodicals. The staff of volunteers loosely covers the 300 counties that compose the country; eventually they hope to have an interviewer for each area with 10,000 inhabitants.

The interviewers come from many environments. The professional staff considers that their most interesting volunteer groups are the industrial workers (200) and the collective and individual farmers (160). They also have volunteer students (100), scientific workers (40), engineers (200), and an equal number with a background of education in economics. Teachers (160) participate, housewives (50), and a few old-age pensioners. Women comprise only 15 percent of the total—in strong contrast to our own practice, where part-time jobs as pollsters account for a considerable number of women's working hours. The Center is eager to have more Polish women participate; they have found, however, that women seem less willing than men to do social work. But when they do, they excel, for in the Center's opinion there is a "woman's secret"—an easy ability to establish contacts and maintain an atmosphere of sympathetic yet detached interest. There are no traveling expenses, so each interviewer works in his or her own plant or neighborhood.

What kind of surveys has the Center completed? A study on housing, one of the most acute problems in Poland. Another on the attitude of the population towards saving. Still another, a timed-to-the-headlines survey, on the attitudes of people towards layoffs in reducing personnel in administration—one of Gomulka's significant reforms upon assuming leadership of the government.

In the housing study, one of the questions asked was: "Would you like to live in a one-family house?" One would imagine, with the fantastically crowded conditions that exist, that everybody would re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spond with a rousing *Tak*. Yet only the professionals, the highest-paid intellectuals, and skilled workers answered that they would. The heavily industrialized area of Silesia in southern Poland, where mining and steel works predominate, produced the greatest number of positive responses. Unskilled workers, however, answered that they would not: they were afraid to live in a one-family house because of the high cost, and they could not count on having enough money for repairs, necessary improvements, and so on.

In the *kwestionariusz* on saving, three topics were taken up. Is it worthwhile to save? At present? And for what purpose? Seventeen percent more answered that it was worthwhile to save in the abstract than at present. It was found that about half the people who filled out the questionnaires did save—principally for apartments and for household equipment such as a washing machine or television set. Very few saved for cars, which are prohibitive in price, but a good many for motorcycles.

In the survey on layoffs to reduce the bureaucratic administrative load, there was a general acceptance of the government decision. Specific questions were also asked, such as: "Do you consider that those who remain will work better?" (Many people answered no.) "Who should be released, and who should not be released under any consideration?" Almost everyone responded that sole supporters of families should not be dismissed. What did come as a surprise to the survey-takers was the fact that people with high skills did not receive a large number of points in the categorizing of those who should remain at their posts.

One of the most interesting surveys—dealing with the prestige of work—is currently in process of being tabulated. The aim of this investigation is to show how each profession evaluates itself and others. Three graphs indicate the correlation between material benefits, prestige of the occupation, and conviction of the steady character of the work. The jobs selected give a spectrum of present-day Polish society: party secretary, priest, locksmith, doctor, merchant, government official, cleaning woman, collective farm worker, bus conductor, secretary, white-collar worker, construction worker, teacher, militiaman (policeman to us), salesgirl, bookkeeper, department head, minor civil servant, agricultural engineer, factory foreman, army officer, machinist, journalist, steel worker, aircraft pilot, professor, dressmaker, lawyer.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The results of this survey vary in the extreme. For instance, both teachers and nurses came out with high prestige but low pay; merchants with low prestige and a low estimate of the steady character of such work, but high in material benefits. The profession of priest emerges with a high rating for permanency; prestige and pay about average. Professors are accorded the highest prestige of all, but they are low on salary. A top government official—the equivalent of our Secretary of State—shows the highest pay, yet prestige only slightly above average, and very weak on the steady character of such employment. For workers skilled in the use of machine tools, pay and prestige both rate slightly above average, with a very high conviction about the steady character of the work. Cleaning women show average for steadiness, with low pay and low prestige; the same holds true for agricultural workers on state farms. A secretary in a bureau—the equivalent of our file-clerk or typist—rates low on all three graphs; doctors rate very high on all three.

The most ambitious project now under way is a twenty-part cycle of studies on "Plans for Life and Viewpoints of Young People." Addressed to those born between 1935 and 1943, it deals not only with choice of work after finishing secondary school, but also the use of leisure time, approaches to cultural problems, world outlook, ideas on marriage, friendship, family relationships, religion, and certain other topics that seem almost frivolous to us, accustomed as we are to the notion that all socialist youth are brought up to follow monolithic lines of behavior. Some of the questions sound as though they could come right out of our own Eugene Gilbert's teen-age polls.

The initial section is headed: "What are you striving for in life?" The suggested categories, in that order, are "Happiness and love, High professional skill, Social welfare, Leading political position, I do not strive for anything special," with a sixth space being left blank for a write-in answer. The young people are also queried as to which language they would want to master, and the suggested languages—again in the order given on the questionnaire form—are English, French, German, Russian, none, blank space.

Leading questions and answers are included. A sample: "What is the most important thing at present for the good of mankind?" Suggested answers: "The quickest domination of cosmic space, To save peace at any cost, World-wide socialism, Development of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Christian religion all over, The domination of atomic energy for peaceful use."

Another section affords insight into the identity of Poland's contemporary problems. "What in your opinion is most important for Poland at present?" ("Increase of honesty of people? Greater work efficiency of each citizen? Foreign aid, by way of supplies and credits from other countries? Increase of discipline and obedience to the government? Further development of education and strengthening of culture? Development of technical sciences and quick industrialization of the country? Planned birth control? Progress in the general democratization of life? Struggle against alcoholism?")

The section "What do you understand by democracy?" has some further pointed questions as subheadings. ("Equal living standards? Freedom of thought and speech? Parliamentary structure? System of economic liberalism? [This is Polish terminology for capitalism.] Proletarian dictatorship? Socialization of the basic means of production—that is, factories and agriculture?") Provision for a write-in answer is also made, and more than one answer may be underscored.

A parallel section to this asks: "What are your political beliefs?" Suggested answers are: "I regard myself as a Communist, as a Socialist, as a Democrat, I support the system of economic liberalism, I regard myself as an Anarchist, I have no determined political convictions, I do not feel linked with any political line but I agree with the existing political reality in Poland—it suits me." Again, a blank space is provided for a write-in answer, and as in the previous section, more than one answer may be underscored.

Many other illuminating questions are propounded. "Do you think state power has the right to imprison for political convictions? For political activities?" "Do you think that capital punishment should be abolished all over the world?" "Do you believe the world was created by God?" (Possible answers to all of these are: Yes, No, I don't know.) "Do you regard yourself as a: Roman Catholic, Atheist, These problems do not concern me," and a blank space for a fill-in answer. "What value in people of your own sex do you most appreciate: Political power? Knowledge? Beauty? High pay? Heroic deed? Results in sports? Work for others? Success with the other sex? Fame?"

Several of the sections dealing with youthful morality could be interesting to propound to our own teen-agers. "Are you ready to condemn," the questionnaire asks, "lying for your own interest?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lying for a good purpose? Theft of private property? Theft of social or public property? An act against organizational norms? ["organization" referring here to a group to which one belongs voluntarily]. Violation of military oath? Negligence at work? Negligence of family duties? Abortion?" The answers suggested are: "Yes, irrespective of circumstances, Yes, in certain cases, I do not condemn at all."

Again, questions such as the following, if addressed to American rather than Polish youth, might produce some enlightening responses. "Do you interfere and do you personally react in the following circumstances: When a street accident occurs in your presence? When your friend steals tools or money from the institution in which he works or studies? In marital questions of your parents? In marital questions of your friends? Of your neighbors?" (Answer either yes or no, and if you have had no direct occasion for such experience, indicate how one should react in such cases.)

The results of this elaborate youth survey—I have listed here only some of the categories—will not be available for many months to come. The statistics and conclusions will undoubtedly be interesting to note, but for our purposes of understanding what life under socialism is like, it is significant that questions of this kind are being asked at all.

Meanwhile, the Center is going ahead with future surveys that they hope will aid government economic planners more directly. Topics to be taken up include: consumption in cities and villages; work efficiency in industrial areas; where people buy; the structure of food consumption; household economy and restaurants; surveys in the cultural field, such as reading preferences, attitudes to theatre and theatre repertoires, preferences in the plastic arts (to be equated with our category of household furnishings), preferences in films.

Some of these surveys are now getting under way; several exceedingly practical ones have already been completed, such as the one on what people would most like to buy, which is expected to provide helpful material for the makers of government price policies.

So far the Center for Public Opinion is unique in the socialist world. But if peace prevails, and relations between the two jagged halves of the world improve, we can probably look forward to more such open-forum questioning of their citizens and subsequent enlightenment for ourselves.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LIGHT ON AFRICA

BY KEITH M. BUCHANAN

The traditional pattern of African society has been destroyed by the impact of the West; out of the chaos, new patterns of life are emerging, painfully. Some of these are deformed; some, like Mau Mau, are abortions. Western ideas, and the example of Asia, have encouraged the rise of African nationalism; it's a strident nationalism, with all the cocksureness, the impatience, the idealism, and the capacity for mistakes of the young. Confronted by the breakdown of African tribal society and by this new national consciousness, the scattered white groups in Black Africa are striving to maintain their position. Sometimes, as in Kenya or Nyasaland, the means they use reflect little credit on them; sometimes, as in West Africa, they have made an honest attempt to establish a basis for coexistence.

We can attempt to gain some understanding of the ferment in Africa today from official reports and handouts; from the writings of sociologists and economists, or from the occasional features in our daily paper or magazine. But these sources have their limitations. They usually make heavy reading. And they convey little of the hopes and fears, the selflessness and the unscrupulous self-seeking, which lie behind the events briefly chronicled in the daily press. If we want to obtain a vivid picture of the quality of life in Africa today, of the interplay of forces which provides an explanation of each day's news, we must turn to the novel. The novel finds its origin at the points of greatest tension in a society; it is freed from the limitations of the official report; it enables us to see Africa from the inside, through the eyes of White Africans and Black Africans alike.

The very spate of novels coming out of Africa today underlines Europe's new awareness of Africa. It underlines, too, the preoccupation of many Europeans living in Africa with the critical problems now facing them. For some years I have been collecting African novels,

---

Keith M. Buchanan is Professor of Geography at the Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. He earlier taught at the University of Natal, South Africa, and University College, Ibadan, Nigeria. He is currently working on a study of the human and social geography of Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

partly because of a continuing interest in a continent where I lived and taught, partly as background material to a textbook on the continent I am preparing. The list of titles now runs to some four score, some bad, some good, many first rate. I can obviously refer to only a few of them in this paper.

I think we can get a better understanding of the African scene if we think of life in pre-European Africa—say 4 or 5 generations ago—as existing in a very delicate state of balance. This equilibrium was both biological and social. Biologically, there was a delicate balance between the vegetation and the grass-eating animals, the flesh-eating animals who preyed on them, the men who ate or who were eaten, and the great complex of disease organisms who preyed on plant, animal, or man. Stuart Cloete has portrayed this graphically in his novel *The Curve and the Tusk;* so, too, has Gerald Hanley in his *The Year of the Lion*. The coming of the white man destroyed the balance. He shot the lions and leopards, so that the zebras and baboons, with no check to their increase, swarmed destructively over the farmlands. He took to himself great areas of the best farmlands, confining the Africans to reserves. African farming methods were admirably suited to conditions of poor soils and erratic climate, but demanded much land. Confined within the cramping limits of the tribal reserve such methods began to destroy soil and vegetation. And the white man's medicine began to cut the death rates of men and beasts so that human and animal populations soared as the land available for their support dwindled through overgrazing and overcultivation. This destruction of the old balance of things lies at the root of many problems in Africa today.

So, too, did the coming of the European destroy the social equilibrium. In her Kenya-located novel, *Red Strangers,* Elspeth Huxley has described this delicate social balance:

> A man may be compared to a strand of silk within a spider's web. No thread can hang alone; each is linked with its fellows to make a whole. . . . So long as all the threads hold together the web is strong. . . . But whenever a strand snaps, the web is weakened.

The impact of the intensely individualistic ideas of the West on such a society was bound to be destructive. Its destructive impact has been increased tenfold by color prejudice which prevents the detribalized black man from merging into the new westernized societies we have created. As Stuart Cloete puts it:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> The best hope of a Kaffir is that of a dog. His best hope that he may find a good white master. And his heart is bitter, for the old way is destroyed, and there is no new way that can fully fill the void of his aspirations. . . . Frustrated . . . he turns inward in sullen introspection, or outwards into revolt.

The plight of these "Men of Two Worlds," has been the subject of many novels. Outstanding are Joyce Cary's *Mister Johnson,* Doris Lessing's short novel *Hunger,* in her collection entitled *Five,* and Peter Abraham's study *Mine Boy.*

Frustration, turning outwards in revolt, and given an additional bitterness by land grievances, lay behind the Mau Mau movement in Kenya. Robert Ruark's novel *Something of Value* provides a picture of the Black terror and White counter-terror in Kenya during this period. Elspeth Huxley, in her *A Thing to Love,* gives a more subjective picture, from the white settlers' angle; while the formative elements in the situation are described in her *Red Strangers* and, more recently, in Gerald Hanley's *Drinkers of Darkness.* The bitter harvest of this revolt, the incomprehension of the settler, are well expressed in one of the last sentences of this novel:

> Regretfully, Tamlin climbed back to his new scenery, the scenery of an Africa he was going to distrust and in which the Africans had grown blacker and the White men whiter *and he could not think why.* [Emphasis added]

Far to the South, in the British territory of Basutoland, the progressive reduction of the powers of the chiefs has led to a similar frustration. In a desperate attempt to re-establish their power and prestige, they have reverted to the barbaric practice of ritual murder, and throughout the past decade there have been periodical outbreaks of such murders. A. S. Mopeli-Paulus, himself a Basuto, has collaborated with European writers in two novels which portray ritual murder against the background of Basuto society. The first was written with Peter Lanham and entitled *Blanket Boy's Moon;* the second, *Turn to the Dark,* with M. Basner, who is Native Representative in the Senate of the Union of South Africa.

The intrusion of the white colonist, then, has created a new disequilibrium and a wide range of social, economic, and political problems which are spotlighted from day to day in our papers. There are two groups of colonists—the transients of lowland tropical Africa—mainly administrators, missionaries, or commercial folk—and the true

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

settlers who are scattered through High Africa from Kenya to the Cape. It is becoming increasingly clear that one of the main problems facing these settlers is not that of adjustment to new climates but to a new human environment, to a life often isolated and among a population inaccessible because of language difficulties, potentially hostile. Hanley describes the psychological impact of East Africa on its white population in vivid terms:

> The whole country had a queer effect on white people. . . . The drinkers drank more, the ascetic became more ascetic, the fleshly more fleshly, those with a tendency to eccentricity became daily more uncertain in their behaviour.

We might well bear this in mind when attempting to assess the words and deeds of these white groups in Africa; it explains a good deal.

Today, the farming settler is an exception; the new settler is usually a skilled man or a professional man who settles in the growing suburb-girt cities of the white man. Doris Lessing has written of both groups. Her first novel, *The Grass Is Singing,* is an account of the psychological destruction of a white woman by the loneliness and frustrations of life on a pioneer farm.

Her later novels, *Martha Quest* and *A Proper Marriage,* paint in sombre tones the quality of life in the white cities of central Africa; the pettiness and meanness and intolerance of the English suburbs transplanted onto the soil of Africa; the frustration which vents itself on the African servants, on the swarming mass of dark-skinned peoples around. Her picture of a Rhodesian town, with its white area; its tin-roofed shanties where Coloreds or half castes live; and its straggling African slums, is an epitome of the whole Southern African situation:

> Three worlds of life, quite separate, apparently self-contained, apparently linked by nothing but hate. . . .

The Union of South Africa makes headline news as frequently as all other African territories combined. It is a doubtful distinction, since most of the news is of fresh repressive laws directed against the non-white population or, less frequently, of occasional acts of resistance by Africans or Indians. The Union's white population is the largest in Black Africa; its native peoples the most completely detribalized. It presents the paradox of growing economic integration of Black and White and increasingly drastic legislation to perpetuate and widen the social gulf between the two groups. It shows fantastic extremes of wealth and poverty. The social disequilibrium, the tension and strains

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of this South African pigmentocracy, offer, like Victorian England, a fruitful field for the novelist.

Alan Paton's great novel, *Cry, The Beloved Country,* is worth all the official reports ever published, for the understanding it gives of the South African tragedy. The complete and utter disintegration of African life in the slums of Johannesburg, the senseless destruction of human dignity and human decency in this segregated society of South Africa, are documented by Phyllis Altman in her tragic and harrowing novel, *The Law of the Vultures.*

The imposition of a system of segregation destroys not only those discriminated against, but, by an insidious undermining of all moral values and a general brutalization of life, it destroys also those who administer the system. *Episode,* by Harry Bloom, describes this process and is a bitter indictment of the whole South African system. The author is a Johannesburg lawyer and was one of those indicted last year in the celebrated "Treason Trial". After reading these novels one may well wonder, "Is there any place in our multi-racial Commonwealth for a state founded on such a denial of human rights and dignity?"

Perhaps we can tolerate these things because we get into the habit of thinking of these problems in the abstract, because we do not see the individual human tragedy, the tens of thousands of human tragedies, behind a cold line of print in our newspaper. It is here that the novelist makes his greatest contribution to our awareness of the issues around us, for in his work he portrays the working out of policies, the impact of systems such as the *apartheid* system of South Africa, in terms of their effects on the individual human being. Alan Paton's second novel, *Too Late the Phalarope,* is a great and terrible book for this very reason: it shows how the savage racial laws of the Union can utterly destroy the individual who is forced to transgress these laws. And, as Gerald Gordon shows in his moving novel, *Let the Day Perish,* these iron laws can rend a family in twain and utterly destroy it.

Such novels enable us to glimpse the human reality behind the headlines. Above all, they illustrate how, in the multiracial territories, the denial of the most basic human rights has created a bitterness and a distrust which are almost insuperable obstacles to the peaceful coexistence of Black and White in Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR READING

Southern and Central Africa

Of the many writers who have attempted to capture the quality of life in the white settler countries of Africa, the Rhodesian writer Doris Lessing is outstanding; the decision of the Government of the Central African Federation to declare her a "prohibited immigrant" indicates clearly the direction of political trends in the Federation. *Martha Quest* and *A Proper Marriage* are the first two volumes in a series of five novels entitled collectively *Children of Violence;* the third, *A Ripple from the Storm,* appeared in 1958. Her collections of short stories, *This was the Old Chief's Country, Five,* and *The Habit of Loving,* give a picture of the life of Africans and Europeans in the pigmentocracies of South and Central Africa.

Nadine Gordiner's novel, *The Lying Days,* and her collections of short stories, *The Soft Voice of the Serpent* and *Six Feet of the Country,* bring into sharp focus the contrasting reactions of the individuals to life in a segregated society, the courageous and desperate rebellion of the few, the brittle cultivated indifference of the many. Other major writers include Daphne Rooke (*Mittee* and *Ratoons*) and Stuart Cloete; the latter's novel, *Turning Wheels,* gives the Afrikaner version of the Great Trek and can be usefully compared with Peter Abraham's *Wild Conquest* which describes the same period as seen through African eyes. F. Venter's *Dark Pilgrim* is similarly valuable as giving a picture, through Afrikaner eyes, of the process of detribalization in Johannesburg described earlier by Paton in *Cry, The Beloved Country.*

East Africa

Gerald Hanley's *Consul at Sunset* is set among the desert nomads of Northeast Africa; it contains a masterly portrayal of the varied responses of governors and governed to the sundown of imperialism. Denys Jones *Look not upon Me,* centers on love across the color line in Kenya and L. Thompson's *A Time to Laugh* might best be characterized as a "Sudanese Good Soldier Schweik."

West Africa

The conservative and feudalistic society of the Northern Nigerian emirates is the background to Elspeth Huxley's novel, *The Walled City;* the volume also gives an insight into the working of the British colonial administration and a picture, not entirely sympathetic, of emergent African nationalism. W. R. Loader's *The Guinea Stamp* and M. Freshfield's *Stormy Dawn* are set in the post-war Gold Coast; their characters are the new educationalists and those they teach and their stories hinge on the impact of European culture on the African and the impact of African society on the European. G. Garnier's *White People Smile at Me* describes, sensitively and sympathetically, the problem of an evoluée, "rootless and nationless since the lure of their (European) civilization turned me from my path."

African Writers

C. Ekwensi's *People of the City* are the Westernized middle class of Lagos; M. Beti's *Mission to Kala* describes, with a humorous detachment, the return of a Western-schooled youth to the traditional society of his home village; C. Achebe, *Things Fall Apart,* is an account, by an Ibo, of the old village life of his people and of its disintegration under the impact of the West.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

Soft Pedal on Peace and Friendship

Wherever Vice President Nixon went in the Soviet Union he was greeted with applause and cries of "peace and friendship." Mr. Nixon learned the Russian equivalent of this phrase and shouted it back to the Soviet crowds until "peace and friendship" became a recognized and accepted part of every contact between this United States official and the Soviet public.

So far as Washington is concerned, Prime Minister Khrushchev will receive no such cordial reception in the United States. An inspired front page story in the *New York Times* (of August 20th) gave this version of the official United States attitude:

> There is complete awareness here in Washington that the Soviet Union hopes to find propaganda material in Mr. Khrushchev's visit. There is some official apprehension here that the visit may give rise to another dose of "the Geneva spirit"—the false optimism that prevailed during and immediately after the summit meeting in Geneva in 1955.
>
> Therefore there is every intention of making plain that the visit is an official one and not a demonstration of friendliness. It will be made evident that Mr. Khrushchev was not invited to the United States to obscure the fundamental differences between the United States and the Soviet Union on critical problems.
>
> To this end it is hoped here that photographers will not press for arms-across-the-shoulder shots or demand excessive handshaking.

President Eisenhower made an important contribution to the cold-shouldering of the Soviet Prime Minister by appointing Henry Cabot Lodge as his personal representative to accompany the foreign guest throughout his stay in the United States. As chief of the United States delegation to the United Nations, Ambassador Lodge has been one of the bitterest and most vitriolic opponents of communism as a social theory and of the Soviet Union for its attempt to build a communist social order.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why this gay, friendly, official, and popular hospitality for a United States visitor to the Soviet Union and this planned malevolence directed against a Soviet visitor to the United States?

On its face, the answer is simple. Ever since the 1917 Revolution, United States achievements have been admired in the Soviet Union. While Soviet policy has opposed United States policy, Soviet spokesmen have proclaimed their friendship for the American people, and their intention to equal and excel United States technical achievements. In the United States, on the other hand, political, business, and religious leaders have carried on a forty-year "Hate Communism! Hate Russia!" campaign that has been intensified since 1946. The consequent intolerance, fear, and hatred have been directed at all things Russian. Today they are being concentrated on the Soviet Prime Minister.

But the contrast between the Nixon reception in the Soviet Union and the Khrushchev reception in the United States is not merely the result of propaganda. It has basic historical causes.

Soviet economy and Soviet leadership can contemplate a reduction of cold-war tension without alarm. In fact they look forward eagerly to such a development, because it would give them a chance to push ahead with the building of communism. That is the reason for the oft-repeated Soviet proposals for peaceful coexistence.

United States economy and United States leadership find themselves in quite a different position. Coexistence presupposes the continuance of two social systems on the planet—capitalism and socialism. For anti-Communists, coexistence is a smear word and peace talk gives them jitters. Cold war, with its arms spending of at least $400 billion per decade, is the keystone of the shaky arch which supports the United States profit economy. A declaration of peace and a program of rapid disarmament would knock a hole in the superprofits of United States Big Business and raise unemployment from its present level of about four million to at least three times that figure.

Hence the flabby hand, the false smile, and the cold heart which official Washington is proposing to offer the Soviet Premier. Let there be no friendly crowds and no peace talk. Let him see what we want him to see and let him go home with his tail between his legs.

President Eisenhower realizes that the remnants of private enterprise still functioning in the United States draw the breath of life

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from arms spending and preparation for hot nuclear war. Washington wants to greet the Soviet Premier formally and coldly. If the State Department has its way, suspicion and hostility will crackle in the air that Khrushchev breathes during his visit to North America. There must be the minimum of handshaking. The American people must turn their backs. Above all, there must be no chorus of "peace and friendship" such as that with which the people of the Soviet Union greeted the Vice President of the United States.

Peace Jitters

Inflated prices on the New York Stock Exchange declined sharply when it was announced that there would be an exchange of visits between the United States President and the Soviet Prime Minister. Visits meant personal meetings, conversations, negotiation, perhaps a lowering of tensions, a possible lessening pressure for cold war and a conceivable determination to live and let live that would reduce arms spending and lead eventually to substantial disarmament.

Small wonder that the stock market reacted unfavorably. The conversion of an arms economy based on government arms spending of at least forty billion dollars annually, into a peace economy engaged in the production of essential goods and services is a major operation involving difficult readjustments. This is doubly true in an economy which has been built around war spending for two decades.

A bird in hand is worth two in the bush. United States business and political leaders have learned how to deal with a bulging Federal budget in which wars—past, present, and future—account for four fifths of the spending. They face possible peace with real concern. Admirals and generals, as well as munition workers, would be jobless in a period of general peace until they had readjusted themselves to a civilian way of life. United States leadership is trained in war, prepared for war, and in fact (if not in theory) lives by war. In a community seriously working for peace, these offspring of war would be like fish out of water. For them peace is disrupting, and alarming.

No Need to Worry

Thoughts about the peace danger must have been uppermost in the minds of the editors of *Newsweek* when they wrote the reassuring report to United States business which appeared on August 24th:

> The harsh fact in the mind of every Washington authority was that the United States and its allies could relax their defenses only at grave peril until the flaming issues between East

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and West were finally settled—maybe years, or even decades, hence.

Nevertheless, there was cautious optimism in the capital that Russia might be ready to explore the subject of disarmament in good faith for the first time. . . .

With the Russian people hungry for a more rapid rise in their standard of living which the economy, strained by a heavy arms program, cannot provide, some experts reasoned that the Kremlin might make a virtue of necessity, and agree to ban atomic tests and limit armed forces under terms acceptable to the West.

But even assuming a genuine Soviet desire to negotiate and the best possible outcome of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks, the experts think it would take years, with each side moving ever so cautiously, before there would be a meaningful limitation on arms. And even if there were such an agreement, it might result only in holding U.S. defense costs to their present level and preventing the increases now projected to pay for ever more intricate weapons. (Administration economists now estimate that the annual defense budget will rise $15 billion to $20 billion in the next ten years to a total near $60 billion by 1970.)

At some time in the future, disarmament may be a possibility. Meantime, official Washington plans to increase arms spending (the direct federal subsidy to Big Business) at about the same rate as the rise in the nation's gross product.

United States Big Business has no need to worry. Its profits will be all-but-guaranteed by the government. The stock market can go on rising. Government budget deficits can continue. Price inflation can further impoverish those with fixed incomes. Workers who have jobs and farmers who still have farms can trail behind the mounting costs of living, while jobless millions go from one employment office to the next.

Washington can use the cold war to obliterate opposition at home and bludgeon resistance. United States capitalism, in 1970, will be spending sixty thousand millions in preparation for wholesale destruction and mass murder.

No up-and-up continues indefinitely. Like every other social sequence, this one has an apex leading to a catastrophic or a gradual decline.

Sand in the Sugar

Every chain has its weakest link. Proposals for an indefinite continuation of the cold war are meeting with resistance. Even here at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

home new voices are being raised against continued economic expansion based on an arms economy. Abroad the popular opposition is leading to official protests.

"The real story of the Eisenhower trip to Europe," wrote *U.S. News & World Report* in its August 31st "Newsgram" from Washington, is that "at a critical stage of the 'cold war,' the Western Allies are squabbling among themselves. Resentments, first about one thing, then about another, are building up, threatening the partnership. Eisenhower's purpose is to calm things down." The editors do not say it in so many words, but Western Europe is growing restive and resentful under Washington's leadership. In Britain and France there are threats of disaffection that may strain NATO unity to the breaking point.

"After this trip," the Newsgram continues, "it's going to be harder than ever to avoid a 'summit' meeting. Britain's MacMillan wants it. Khrushchev wants it. . . . The White House now appears to look on it as a foregone conclusion."

Meetings at the summit may or may not alter the pattern of world affairs. But the possibility that such a meeting might lessen tensions, might downgrade cold war and reduce arms spending, keeps Wall Street awake nights and leads to heel-dragging in Washington.

Fateful Decision in Asia

Under Prime Minister Nehru's sponsorship and direction, the central government at New Delhi dissolved and replaced the government of the State of Kerala on July 30, 1959. The Kerala government was elected during the Indian general election of 1957.

India and the governments of its component states, except Kerala, were controlled by the Congress Party. Kerala's government was directed by a coalition in which the Communist Party was the controlling factor. Mr. Nehru and his Congress Party are energetically anti-Communist.

Under the Constitution of India, the central government, for cause, may remove and replace the government of an Indian state. The "cause," in the case of Kerala, was an education law which transferred control of the schools from the local theocracy to the state, and a land law which seriously tackled the problem of land distribution. The technique used to justify the removal of the Kerala government was a campaign of demonstrations, boycotts, strikes, picketing, and riots directed against the government. The campaign

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was led by the local theocracy and supported by the Kerala Congress Party and the most reactionary elements in the state.

Kerala's experiment in going Communist by popular election was unique. Most Asian governments dedicated to building socialism have been established as a result of war and revolution. The electoral method employed in Kerala was legal and non-violent. As a result of its success, the Communist Parties in other Indian States were working effectively to follow Kerala's example and make India Communist by ballot.

New Delhi's action in removing duly elected officials because of mob violence, mobilized by the opposition, puts a premium on lawlessness. It also serves notice on Communists inside and outside of India that if they wish to win office and direct public policy they must be prepared to use force and violence.

All the News Our Masters Want

Now and then the press is tested out by some outstanding event which it dare not report. Every second year, beginning in 1947, young people from all over the world have met in Festivals of Youth, to greet each other, exchange opinions, and compare the prowess of their respective countries in a friendly give-and-take covering a wide range of cultural activities and sport. In late July and early August, 1959, 17,000 young people from 110 countries, meeting in Vienna for ten days, presented a varied, exciting, and distinguished program that interested, educated, and enlightened participants and beholders. Was this significant affair reported in the American press? Some denunciations and State Department warnings appeared before the event, but so far as we know, except in the Left press, no straight news of the festival was published. The 1959 Youth Festival was blacked out because the masters of the press were against it.

At odd times and in sundry places, the purveyors of news have performed their alloted tasks with skill, professional competence, and devotion to the general welfare. In the United States, at least, the chief task of the press is to huckster everything from cosmetics and automobiles to habit-forming drugs. In the chinks and crannies between the ads the papers censor, misinform, amuse, and beguile their hapless readers. Occasional voices are raised in opposition to the corruption and degradation of the press. To such protests there is a stock answer: "You must be a Communist. We have the world's highest standard of living."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Important Soviet Articles in
English Translation

SOVIET HIGHLIGHTS

A new monthly journal surveying Soviet thought and developments

In the September issue: biographical notes on Khrushchev; Ehrenburg's comments on the Khrushchev visit; an article by Khrushchev examining problems of automation, productivity, efficiency and other aspects of the Soviet economy.

$6.00 per year (12 issues); 50c per copy (prepaid)

INTERNATIONAL ARTS AND SCIENCES PRESS

33 West 42nd Street, New York 36, N. Y.

(Advertisement)

(*continued from inside back cover*)

Scott Nearing is giving three lectures in the New York area later this month, all at 8:30 p.m., as follows: October 14th—Rainbow Club House, 150 West 85th Street, Manhattan; October 16—Boro Park Fraternal Society, 5115 10th Avenue, Brooklyn; and October 18—Brighton Beach Community Center, 3200 Coney Island Avenue, Brooklyn. Scott and Helen Nearing also announce the publication of a new pamphlet, "Our Right to Travel," available from the Social Science Institute, Harborside, Maine at 25¢ a copy.

A subscriber in New Haven, Connecticut, writes suggesting that other readers do as he has done in writing to book review editors of nationally read newspapers and magazines complaining about their failure to review serious books published by MR Press and other left-wing publishers. We wholeheartedly endorse the suggestion.

Have You Joined MR Associates Yet?
If Not, Are You Going To?
If You Are, Why Not NOW?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

For later publication, we are happy to announce the most recent book of Claud Cockburn, *Crossing the Line,* which won widespread critical acclaim when it was published in Britain. Oldtimers will not need to be told that during the later 1930s Claud Cockburn was the editor of that wonderful little British newsletter *The Week.* Like everything Claud Cockburn writes, *Crossing the Line* is very funny; but it is also an important and serious contribution to the understanding of the labyrinth of left-wing politics in the period of fascism and war.

One of our most respected charter subscribers writes as follows:

> I am tremendously impressed by *Conviction,* which came about a week ago. It is extremely well written—those British do know how to use the language—and the writers I have read so far make very good points indeed. I had been inclined to attribute a considerable part of the political apathy among American intellectuals to McCarthy, the Un-American Committee, etc. To my knowledge, there has been nothing comparable in Britain and yet the state of political apathy does seem comparable. It would seem to follow that other factors are more important and cut across national lines. . . . In general, the essays recall many of my ideas and feelings of some time past, made them still seem valid though the general or particular framework has changed.
>
> I was also very impressed with the issue on the New Capitalism. It is the kind of issue which one lends to friends because it touches on such important current misconceptions. I just hope that the friend I lent it to will join the subscribers' list—I kind of think he will. Leo Huberman's figures on income distribution are always so arresting. I also very much liked the article by Leo Marx, especially the first half.

Official publication date for *Conviction* is October 7: on that date the price goes up from $2.50 to $4. If your order is postmarked October 7 or earlier it will be filled at the lower price. If for some reason this issue reaches you after October 7, make a note to that effect along with your order and we will treat it as though it got under the wire. Last chance for every one to save $1.50.

The Wall Between by Anne Braden is now available as a Liberty-Prometheus paperback at $1 plus 25¢ for postage and handling. We would like to suggest that you take advantage of this to give copies to your friends or, better still perhaps, your enemies on the question of racial equality in the United States. Send orders to Marzani & Munsell, 100 West 23rd Street, New York 11.

In our June editorial on Dulles, we cited "a scheme of the early 1920s, of which Dulles was the principal author, to carve up Russia into a number of protectorates of the Western imperialist powers." Several readers wrote asking for further information about this. We checked the source on which we had, carelessly as it turns out, relied and found it wanting in both detail and documentation. Further research has failed to produce any reliable evidence. To be sure, such a scheme was discussed by the British and French at the time of the Versailles Peace Conference, but we can find no record of Dulles having been involved. If any readers can produce further information we would be glad to have it. Meanwhile, in the interests of accuracy, we would like to retract the disputed statement. Needless to say, this in no way affects the substance of our argument concerning Dulles's attitudes and policies.

(*continued on page* 224)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RUSSELL SCHOLARS' CLASSICS IN PHILOSOPHY, HISTORY OF IDEAS, HISTORY LITERATURE & CRITICISM

GENERAL HISTORY OF SOCIALISM AND SOCIAL STRUGGLES
Max Beer $7.50

THE HISTORY OF A LITERARY RADICAL AND OTHER PAPERS
Randolph S. Bourne $3.75

THE I. W. W. A STUDY IN AMERICAN SYNDICALISM
Paul F. Brissenden $5.00

BOOKS THAT CHANGED OUR MINDS
M. Cowley and B. Smith $2.50

HISTORY OF THE HAYMARKET AFFAIR
Henry David $6.75

BLACK RECONSTRUCTION IN AMERICA
W. E. B. Du Bois $6.50

FOUNDATIONS OF CHRISTIANITY
Karl Kautsky $5.50

COMMUNISM IN CENTRAL EUROPE IN THE TIME OF THE REFORMATION
Karl Kautsky $6.00

THOMAS MORE AND HIS UTOPIA
Karl Kautsky $4.00

HISTORY OF THE INQUISITION OF THE MIDDLE AGES,
Three volumes
Henry C. Lea $20.00

LITERATURE AND REVOLUTION
Leon Trotsky $3.75

THE GENESIS OF PLATO'S THOUGHT
Alban D. Winspear $5.00

AMERICAN LABOR STRUGGLES
Samuel Yellen $5.00

THE MARCUS W. JERNEGAN ESSAYS IN AMERICAN HISTORIOGRAPHY
W. T. Hutchinson, Ed. $6.50

WITCHCRAFT IN OLD AND NEW ENGLAND
G. L. Kittredge $8.00

DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY.
Ten volumes, second edition with new prefaces
John R. Commons $125.00

POLITICAL THOUGHT OF PLATO AND ARISTOTLE
Ernest Barker $7.50

FRENCH POLITICAL THOUGHT IN THE 19TH CENTURY
Roger H. Soltau $7.50

AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY: THE EARLY SCHOOLS
Woodbridge Riley $8.50

ELIZABETHAN DRAMA, 1558-1642.
Two volumes
Felix E. Schelling $13.50

SPECIAL FOR MONTHLY REVIEW READERS: Deduct 15% on all orders totalling $15.00 or more. Remittance must accompany orders. Books sent post free.

RUSSELL & RUSSELL, INC., Publishers
80 East 11th Street, New York 3, N. Y.

(Advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED